



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Serial No.: 09/239,194 Confirmation No.: 9716  
Applicant: John S. Yates, Jr., et al.  
Title: COMPUTER WITH NON-NATIVE OPERATING SYSTEM  
Filed: January 28, 1999 Art Unit: 9716  
Atty. Docket: 114596-05-4013 Examiner: Kenneth Tang

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Appellant(s) hereby appeal(s) to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the rejections in the Office Action dated April 3, 2006.

No additional fee is required, because the fee was paid in a prior appeal (July 13, 2005).

In the event that any extension of time is required, Appellant petitions for that extension of time required to make timely this Notice of Appeal. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional required fees (including all extension of time fees pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.17), or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-2405, Order No. 114596-05-4013.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

Dated: June 20, 2006

I certify that this correspondence, along with any documents referred to therein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on June 20, 2006 as First Class Mail in an envelope with sufficient postage addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By: 

David E. Boundy  
Registration No. 36,461  
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP  
787 Seventh Ave.  
New York, New York 10019  
(212) 728-8000  
(212) 728-8111 Facsimile

## TABLE OF CONTENTS



I. Real Party in Interest.....	1
II. Related Appeals and Interferences.....	1
III. Status of Claims.....	1
IV. Status of Amendments.....	1
V. Summary of the Subject Matter.....	1
A. Background: the Robinson '095 Patent.....	2
1. Background: Robinson '095, Multi-Tasking and Context Switches.....	2
2. Background: Robinson '095 and Subroutine Calls.....	3
3. Background: Robinson '095 and Software Interpreters.....	4
4. Robinson's Three Major Components are Different.....	5
B. The Embodiment in the Specification.....	5
VI. Argument.....	7
A. Standard of Review.....	7
B. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action - § 112 ¶ 2 Issues.....	9
1. Substantive Legal Standard for Definiteness.....	9
2. Procedural Requirements for Raising an Indefiniteness Rejection.....	10
3. The Claims Meet § 112 ¶ 2, and the Office Action is Insufficient to Raise Any Rejection.....	11
C. Claims 33-36, 38-46, 50 and 52.....	12
1. First Error: Procedurally, the Office Action is Inadequate to Raise any Rejection.....	13
2. Second Error: The Office Action's Analysis of Robinson '095 Relative to Claim 33 is Faulty.....	14
3. Claims 34-36, 38-46, 50 and 52.....	14
D. Claims 79-81.....	15
1. First Error: The Office Action is Procedurally Incomplete – No Rejection Exists.....	15
2. Second Error: The Office Action's Analysis of Robinson '095 Relative to Claim 79 is Faulty.....	16
3. Conclusion as to Claims 79-81.....	17
E. Claims 5-13, 15-24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 82, 83.....	17
1. First Error: The Office Action's Analysis of the Prior Art Relative to Claim 5 is Faulty.....	18
2. Second Error: The Office Action is Procedurally Insufficient to Raise any Rejection.....	18

3.	Claims 6-13, 15-24, 26, 27, 30-31, 82 and 83 are Patentable with Claim 5.....	20
F.	Claims 56-75.....	20
1.	The Office Action Is Too Imprecise and Contains too Many Errors To Raise Any Rejection or to Permit a Response.....	21
2.	Conclusion as to Claims 56-75 .....	23
VII.	Conclusion .....	23